DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 221 FL 023 066

AUTHOR Coleman, James A.
TITLE Progress, Proficiency and Motivation among British University Language Learners. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 40.
INSTITUTION Trinity Coll., Dublin (Ireland). Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
REPORT NO ISSN-0332-3889
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Demography; English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; French; German; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Language Proficiency; *Language Tests; Russian; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Second Languages; Spanish; Student Characteristics; *Student Motivation; Study Abroad; Surveys; Testing; Travel
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

A study of over 3,000 British college and university students investigated the relationship of student language proficiency and student demographic and background characteristics. Proficiency levels were assessed by means of C-Tests, while associated questionnaires sought to explore biographical data, language learning background, residence abroad, attitudes, motivations, strategies, and grammatical knowledge. Subjects were learners of French, German, Spanish, English, and Russian as a second language. The report begins by describing the results of a small-scale survey that indicated widespread ignorance, among university staff, of theoretical constructs underlying language testing. It then reports the divergent performances and progress rates across institutions and examines factors in college student motivation as it evolves during the college experience. Results of the study indicate: both similarities and dissimilarities among learners of different languages; a shift of emphasis in motivations between students in different years of study, with significant changes following residence abroad; major differences between United Kingdom students and their counterparts in Germany and Austria; motivation changes with age, but only marginal gender-based differences occur; and a slight but measurable relationship between integrative and/or resultative motivation and foreign language proficiency. (Contains 31 references.) (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 221

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Centre for Language and Communication Studies

Progress, proficiency and motivation among British university language learners

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Little

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

James A. Coleman

CLCS Occasional Paper No.40

ISSN 0332 3889

Spring 1995

FL023.66

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLCS Occasional Papers

General Editor: D. G. Little

CLCS Occasional Papers report on research carried out within or in association with the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, and on research carried out elsewhere which is of special interest to the Centre's own concerns and activities. In some instances they present the texts of public lectures promoted by the Centre.

The following titles have been published and are available from The Secretary, Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Autumn 1981

1. D. M. Singleton, *Language transfer: a review of some recent research* (31pp.)
2. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Linguistics and oral tradition: the structural study of the riddle* (33pp.)
3. D. M. Singleton, *Age as a factor in second language acquisition* (70pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Summer 1982

4. Francis Nolan, *Voice quality and speech synthesis* (30pp.)
5. Roger Bennett, *Language elicitation procedures* (23pp.)

Winter 1982-3

6. S. M. Devitt, D. G. Little, S. P. O Conchuir & D. M. Singleton, *Learning Irish with* Anois is Arís (128pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Autumn 1983

7. William T. Littlewood, *A communicative approach to language-teaching methodology* (19pp.)
8. Rose Maclaran, *On the interaction of semantics and pragmatics* (18pp.)
9. E. M. Harding, *Compensation strategies* (53pp.)

Autumn 1984

10. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Generative phonology in the clinic* (38pp.)
11. Gearóid O Ciaráin, *The affective dimension in second/foreign language learning: an interactional perspective* (42pp.)

Spring 1985

12. D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little, *Foreign languages at second level: defining a syllabus, with particular reference to the needs of the senior cycle* (19pp.)
13. John Harris, *The polylectal grammar stops here* (12pp.)

Spring 1986

14. D. G. Little and A. J. Grant, *Learning German without a teacher: Report on a self-instructional programme for undergraduate students of Engineering Science at Trinity College, Dublin, 1982-1984* (60pp.)
15. Máire Owens, *Eithne: a study of second language development* (62pp.)
16. D. Wilson and D. Sperber, *Pragmatics: an overview* (36pp.)

Autumn 1986

17. Ailbhe Ní Chasaide & Eugene Davis, *A data-processing system for quantitative analysis in speech production* (28pp.)
18. Seán M. Devitt, *Learning a foreign language through the media* (69pp.)

(continued on inside back cover)

CLCS Occasional Paper No.40
Spring 1995

Progress, proficiency and motivation among British university language learners

by

James A. Coleman
University of Portsmouth

Abstract

Following concern about how knowledgeable and how effective those teaching languages in British higher education may be, a descriptive, quantitative pilot survey was conducted of over three thousand learners of French, German, Spanish, English and Russian in British higher and further education. Proficiency levels were assessed by means of C-Tests, while associated questionnaires sought to explore biographical data, language learning background, residence abroad, attitudes, motivations, strategies, and grammatical knowledge. The present paper first describes a small-scale survey which showed widespread ignorance of theoretical constructs underpinning language testing among university staff. It then lists the divergent performances and rates of progress across different institutions, and examines features of learner motivation and of how it evolves during university studies. The paper goes on to show that there are both similarities and dissimilarities between learners of different languages; that there is a shift of emphasis in motivations between students in different years of study, with significant changes following residence abroad; that there are major differences between UK students and their counterparts in Germany and Austria; that motivation changes with age, but sex-based differences are marginal; and that there is a slight but measurable relationship between integrative and/or resultative motivation and foreign language proficiency. Factor analysis confirms expectations of the principal motivations underlying student responses.

1 The level of awareness of language testing literature among university language teachers: a preliminary study

Despite the work of various professional associations such the British Association for Applied Linguistics and the Association for French Language Studies to spread awareness of issues in language teaching in higher education, there is a widespread perception that there remains a high level of ignorance of the relevant literature among university language teachers.

The mismatch between those who staff university modern language departments — essentially researchers, often in literary, cultural, area-based or linguistic studies — and the main demand coming from the student body — for efficient language teaching — is well understood. So long as the teaching is willingly and competently performed, there seems no reason to look to change the system. But increasingly, concomitantly with resource pressures, questions are being asked about the competence of university modern linguists to optimise the language learning of their students: the persistent adherence, especially in traditional universities, to methods which have been seen for two decades as methodologically unsound is one factor here. At the same time, the separation of teaching and research within departments or between departments is very much on the agenda: should researchers be allowed to devote their time to what they do best, i.e. research, while trained language teachers (often poached from Further Education, or on part-time or temporary contracts) supply the intensive language training? Such a solution would no doubt be initially very attractive to many researchers, some of whom make no secret of their resentment at having to spend time on what they see as the low-status, unintellectual or even mechanical activity of language teaching. But the financial reality cannot be ignored: with 90% of British universities committed to modularisation, under which resources ultimately follow student choice, and with the trend firmly established of a shift from degrees in modern languages (with a literary or, increasingly, area/cultural studies bent) to degrees which include a modern language as a subsidiary skill, it seems likely to become harder and harder to pay for staff literary research out of the revenue from students seeking language tuition. Student choice — as is now thoroughly documented by data from the 1986 Nuffield study analysed by Meara (1993, 1994a, 1994b) — does *not* dictate the existence of large schools of literary or area studies specialists.

The caricature of university language teaching in the 1970s and 1980s

may have a grain of truth in it: Students learnt grammar and the written language at school, they learnt register and the spoken language during the year abroad, and they learnt nothing during three years of prose and translation classes. Two questions concerning our university language teachers, questions which seem so utterly fundamental that it is a wonder they have not yet been satisfactorily researched, are: Do they know what they're doing? and Is it working?

The first question refers to university teachers' knowledge of the considerable literature on language teaching, learning and testing. Since it is student results that matter, as much to the student and his/her parents and employer as to the institution, one might expect language testing to be a topic on which those involved on a daily basis for many years would at least be acquainted with the common notions and terminology and the best-known research. Hence our first question.

On the other hand, it can be argued that a specialised research knowledge of a topic is not required to teach it successfully, even at undergraduate level. One should therefore judge firstly by results. Hence our second question.

One difficulty is that student test results are nearly always determined, at least at intermediate levels, by the teachers themselves. There is no external objective feedback except perhaps from the external examiner, who is always an acquaintance, usually a friend, of the head of department and is partly chosen because of a shared general outlook: in any event, it is most unusual for an external to look at other than Finals examinations. The whole system of external examiners has recently been assessed and found gravely wanting (HEQC 1994).

1.1 Is it working?

There is anecdotal evidence that university language teaching is not working:

- Students themselves often observe that they know less French/German/Spanish at the end of second year than they did at "A" level — I certainly feel this was true of my own German, although I studied in a well-respected redbrick; and every academic, faced with yet another request from the student body for the security blanket of "more grammar classes", will recognise the syndrome: "My language was better at A-level. Your energy goes into the new subject. You don't have any grammar lessons. Unless you are reading your grammar book every night, you forget" (student informant in Evans 1988, p.24).
- A decade ago, in an article entitled, with reckless optimism, "Requiem for the prose? The disappointing reality behind the cherished

ideal" (Coleman 1984), I noted that the French Institute, providing remedial tuition for students in advance of resits, could detect no difference whatsoever between students who had failed first-year exams, and those who had passed first-year exams twelve months earlier but had now failed second-year exams.

- At the 1992 conference of the British Association for Applied Linguistics, the OHP slides of a researcher into the order of acquisition of French grammar revealed, quite incidentally, that on some tests sixth-formers had outperformed undergraduates at a highly rated provincial university with over half a century of language teaching experience.
- An Enterprise in Higher Education director, a senior figure from one of the top universities of the 1960s generation, confided to me his conviction that undergraduates in the said institution made negative progress in foreign languages in their first two years of study.

These observations are far from constituting anything approaching evidence; but they do suggest the need for some serious research on a national scale. It was one of the motivations for a three-stage study based in the University of Portsmouth, and using as a measure of proficiency the C-Test, a modified cloze test developed at our partner University of Duisburg. The C-Test is easy to construct, quick to administer, and easy, objective and unambiguous to score. It is also extremely reliable. To provide a snapshot of a learner's general competence in a foreign language, the C-test is unrivalled (full bibliography in Grotjahn 1995). But first questions first.

1.2 Do they know what they're doing?

I recently co-edited a collection of papers on new approaches in language teaching (Coleman and Rouxeville 1993). One referee, in rejecting an article by a practising language teacher at a traditional university, commented: "I had almost forgotten why we need postgraduate training in language studies. Hélas, I have remembered!" Research into our first question — what do university language teachers know about their own discipline? — has so far taken the form of an informal pre-pilot study which gave predictable but nonetheless disturbing results.

At a conference of university language teachers in January 1993, questionnaires were distributed at two workshops which happened to be devoted to the teaching and assessment of written language skills. There was no advance warning that there would be a questionnaire, still less of what its purpose was. Those who completed the questionnaire arguably represented a random cross-section of university specialists in French,

German, Spanish and Italian, with a number of heads of department, a spread of external examiners, but also several less experienced colleagues. As questionnaires were issued, it was announced that the aim of the preliminary survey was to help devise a questionnaire for research in language testing. So it was, but I also wanted to confirm my impression that despite years or decades of assessing language performance to degree level and beyond, the theoretical knowledge of language testing was very low.

Responses to the "distractor" questions on how orals or general essays are marked were themselves of interest; but the key questions asked for the name of *any* book or *any* journal on language testing, before moving on to central concepts and well-established acronyms in the field.

The first group (14 respondents) complained of a lack of time to complete the definitions in two questions, so the second group (16 respondents) were allowed simply to tick the items in these questions for which they would, given time, be able to supply answers. It is, of course, easier to tick than to define, and one might expect that a proportion of the ticks — like many of the actual answers — represent an incorrect notion of the term or acronym. Handing me completed questionnaires as they left, several respondents referred to their "embarrassment" and their "ignorance"; two senior colleagues even refused to return the questionnaire!

The results of the mini-survey were as follows. Out of thirty mostly experienced professional language teachers, only one could name the obvious, eponymous journal on language testing, and only one could suggest a relevant book — and no, a directly relevant title at that! Half knew of the cloze test, about a third knew or guessed correctly about basic theoretical notions (test reliability, norm-referencing), about a quarter knew content validity, and only two were able to prove they could accurately define face validity or the fundamental statistical term standard deviation. Without these concepts, I would argue that an evaluative reading of literature on language testing research is simply not possible.

On acronyms, the British Association for Applied Linguistics — the major association for those interested in the theory and practice of language learning — was known to only one higher education language teacher in six. The English-Speaking Union, whose definitions of levels of language competence are widely referred to, was known to only one in ten. Only one in thirty identified the Multiple Choice Question from its initials. The fact that none claimed to recognise the spurious acronym ABC suggests that respondents did take the survey seriously.

Clearly, such results are impressionistic and unscientific. But they seem, to me at least, to be disturbing enough to justify further research, and

they have been confirmed by some surprisingly unsophisticated responses to the large-scale survey of students' language proficiency currently under way. Many of us lament the increasing use of part-timers for language teaching, which represented around 20% of the teaching staff in 1992 (Thomas 1993). Perhaps instead we should be looking harder at the full-timers. Or at least at the results they and their students achieve. On to the second question: is it working?

2 The February 1993 pilot study

When 427 students of French at Portsmouth University and local secondary institutions sat a French C-Test (Coleman 1994a), it was demonstrated, firstly, that the C-Test is an ideal tool for large scale proficiency testing, given its economy, practicality, high reliability and criterion-referenced validity. Secondly, a comparison of mean C-Test scores across successive years of study suggested that proficiency levels do, as might be expected, rise as students progress through the system, but that the progress was uneven, being more marked in the top two years of secondary education, and also during residence abroad, than during tuition at university. A cross-sectional study cannot properly determine progress, but the finding did suggest that a broader study and, ultimately, a longitudinal study of a substantial number of learners in a range of institutions would be useful. The Oktobertest provided a broader study.

3 The Oktobertest: the experimental sample

In October 1993, a C-Test in one of five languages, and an extensive questionnaire, were administered to over 3000 language learners in 12 UK universities and 8 other institutions. The study was strictly limited in its objectives, seeking quantitative data, independent of theoretical constraints and experimental hypotheses. The informants represent a large but unstructured sample. For French, the coordinator used personal contacts to obtain the cooperation of a spread of institutions, particularly at university level. While all the universities were in England, four were civic "redbricks", two ex-CATs (Colleges of Advanced Technology which were renamed universities in the 1960s), one was created from scratch in the 1960s, and five are ex-Polytechnics (awarded university status at the beginning of the 1990s). Characterising such institutions is invidious, but, given the peculiarities of higher education in the UK, where universities select students and students select universities on a national and not a local basis, one might expect the civics to recruit the best-qualified

applicants, the ex-CATs to specialise in language teaching, and the ex-Polytechnics to offer the widest range of courses (including modularised programmes) and to accommodate the widest range of entrants.

The sample of students of French included 715 first-year students (203 male, 480 female, 32 unrecorded), 740 second-year students (172 male, 541 female, 27 unrecorded), 313 fourth-year students (82 male, 214 female, 17 unrecorded) as well as 190 secondary students. Of the latter, 65 males and 80 females were in the first year sixth form, 9 males and 31 females in the second year sixth form, with 5 unrecorded.

Of the 700 students of French from civic universities, 493 were women, 181 men (26 unrecorded); 75.5% were under 21 years old, 94.9% under 23, 96.4% under 24. The ex-Polytechnics in the survey had a higher proportion of mature students: 72.1% were aged under 21, 84.5% under 23, 92.7% under 30 years of age. Of these, 245 were men, 637 women, 44 sex unreported. For ex-CATs, the sex distribution was 49 men, 121 women, 9 unreported; 67% under 21, 90.3% under 23. At the new-old university, 90.3% of the sample were under 21, 14 were men, 46 women, 2 unreported. In all sectors, men represented about a quarter of the sample. It is in the ex-polytechnics that the proportion of men was greatest — over 45% in one ex-polytechnic with a modularised degree programme, and over 33% in another. Outside these two institutions, the percentage of men in each year-group ranged from 16.3% to 38%.

3.1 Nationality and family language background of learners of French

Of those responding, 92.59% (1686) had British nationality, 1.26% (23) French nationality, and 6.15% (112) other nationality. The experimental sample would be expected to contain a number of exchange students from French and other European universities. English was the native language of the mothers of 86% (1566) of those responding, and of 87.2% (1589) of their fathers. This compared with 2.9 % (53) of mothers and 1.5% (27) fathers whose first language was French, and 11.1% of mothers (202) and 11.3% of fathers (206) with another native tongue. In all, of 3643 parents on whom information was provided, a surprisingly high 488 (13.4%) did not have English as a first language. Of those responding, 1674 (91.9%) were native English speakers, 31 (1.7%) native French speakers, 116 (6.4%) native speakers of another language. 1736 (95.4%) were schooled in English, 28 (1.5%) in French, while for 56 (3.1%) the language of instruction was neither English nor French.

3.2 Bilingualism: learners of all languages

Among all foreign language learners, including secondary school pupils, only five parents were native bilinguals: in each case one language was English, the others being Spanish (twice), Greek (twice) and French. Only eight respondents had been schooled in two languages: English and Spanish (three respondents), Portuguese, Welsh, French, and Danish; and for one student, Spanish and Portuguese. Twelve students continued to use two languages at home: English and Spanish in seven cases, English and French in five.

In contrast to these low numbers, there were a substantial number, 67 in all, of (self-designated) native bilinguals among the respondents themselves: 19 in English/Spanish, 15 in English/French, 4 in English/Welsh, 4 in English/Portuguese, 3 in English/German, 2 each in English/Arabic and English/Gujarati, one instance each of English with Afrikaans, Armenian, Bantu, Bengali, Catalan, Danish, Dutch, Greek, Italian, Maltese, Punjabi, Swedish, Ukrainian, and Urdu. In addition, there was one Spanish/Portuguese and one Spanish/Catalan bilingual, and two trilinguals: English/Spanish/Portuguese and English/French/Swedish.

In nearly all cases (98.5% for learners of French, 98% for learners of German, 96.4% of learners of Spanish), the language mainly used with parents and relations at the time of the survey was the same as the respondent's first language.

3.3 Residence abroad: learners of all languages

Residence in the target-language community has long been associated with improved proficiency in the target language. In recent years, travel within Europe has become easier and cheaper, and virtually all students had already visited a country where their target language was spoken; those who had not were in a very small minority (2.6% for French, 3.2% for German, 3.4% for Spanish).

4 Proficiency: C-Test scores

There were relatively few students in Year 3 of university study, since most spend at least part of this period residing in a country or countries where their target language(s) is/are spoken. The Year 3 group was clearly heterogeneous in composition and performance, and has been excluded from the data in Table 1.

Table 1 **Mean C-Test scores by university and year-group (excluding groups of fewer than ten students)**

Mean C-Test Total	Year of study	University	N	SD	SEM
62.1	2	10	65	18.9	2.344
62.3	1	04	36	12.2	2.027
65.1	2	11	22	15.9	3.386
65.3	1	08	143	12.2	1.020
66.0	1	01	71	12.2	1.447
67.7	1	10	29	11.9	2.202
68.8	2	04	59	12.2	1.590
69.6	1	11	33	13.0	2.267
69.8	2	08	182	9.9	.733
70.4	1	ALL	715	11.7	.436
71.1	1	05	59	10.4	1.351
71.4	1	07	48	11.3	1.630
71.5	2	01	44	10.4	1.570
71.9	1	12	69	10.8	1.305
72.9	1	03	48	8.0	1.158
73.3	2	ALL	739	11.9	.438
74.6	1	-06	38	9.4	1.532
75.4	2	12	48	7.2	1.046
76.0	2	03	39	6.9	1.104
76.6	4	10	28	12.1	2.281
76.8	2	06	95	7.0	.719
77.2	1	09	103	7.6	.751
78.2	4	04	23	8.8	1.834
78.3	4	11	16	9.7	2.437
78.6	1	02	38	6.9	1.127
78.7	4	08	38	8.6	1.390
80.7	2	09	146	8.3	.683
81.5	2	02	37	5.7	.939
82.1	4	ALL	313	9.6	.540
83.4	4	06	10	6.4	2.034
83.7	4	12	10	8.4	2.663
83.7	4	01	59	7.5	.982
85.3	4	09	99	7.4	.747
85.5	4	03	28	5.7	1.071

As can be seen from Table 1, there are very considerable discrepancies between the average proficiency of students at the same notional level of study but in different institutions. At its most extreme, and taking into account the standard error of the mean, the discrepancies demonstrate that students about to commence their studies in French at certain high-prestige institutions are already as proficient as students entering their final year at other institutions, although the latter, having completed a period of residence abroad, are probably at a peak of linguistic proficiency that they will never attain again. Most university teachers believe intuitively that learners reach a plateau of language proficiency by the end of their residence abroad: the Oktobertest data provides some solid evidence for such a phenomenon, at least for students of German and Spanish (Coleman 1995). Finding such enormous inter-institutional discrepancies, I was prompted to call for the linguistic outcomes of university language courses to be defined and quantified, both in terms of course objectives made available to students, and of certificates detailing proficiency levels achieved (Coleman 1994b). My suggestion that the existing tradition of degree classification was inadequate has since been echoed in an authoritative report on Britain's universities (HEQC 1994).

In a political climate in which educational league tables, however simplistic, may be favoured, such studies are clearly open to mis-interpretation.

5 An excursion into League Tables

League Table 1 Qualifications of Entrants

University	Score	Position	Type
02	78.605	1st	Trad
09	77.137	2nd	Trad
06	74.553	3rd	Trad
03	72.938	4th	ex-CAT
12	71.884	5th	Trad
07	71.375	6th	ex-CAT
05	71.051	7th	1960s
11	69.576	8th	ex-Poly
10	67.655	9th	ex-Poly
01	66.042	10th	ex-Poly
08	65.329	11th	ex-Poly
04	62.306	12th	ex-Poly

Given that one criterion used by journalists compiling league tables of universities is the standard of entrants (usually as measured by A-level scores), the language proficiency of entrants, as measured in the Oktobertest, might be used in a similar way (see League Table 1).

Measuring only by the level of proficiency of those who have just started at the university, the old universities, of all types, win hands down. But this tells us merely that they have at present higher prestige than the ex-polytechnics, so can set higher entrance requirements and attract better-qualified students. It is a measure of reputation, not quality. Perhaps more important is the standard achieved by students who have studied in the institution for three or four years (although only nine universities could include final-year students in the study), as in League Table 2.

League Table 2 Mean Performance of Final-Year Students

University	Score	Position
03	85.500	1st
09	85.273	2nd
01	83.712	3rd
06	83.400	4th
08	78.711	5th
11	78.313	6th
04	78.174	7th
10	76.607	8th
12	75.333	9th

The distinction between types of institution is no longer so clear-cut, with one ex-CAT, one civic and one ex-polytechnic in the top three. This may appear to be a better measure of the effectiveness of teaching, but a still clearer measure might be to compare final proficiency with that of new entrants, in other words to assess the progress or "Value-Added" (see League Table 3).

It would be possible to conclude, from these figures, that to maximise progress in language studies, one should attend an ex-Poly or ex-CAT: despite much lower resources, they appear to deliver more productive teaching.

A comparison of league tables shows very graphically how relative institutional performance depends wholly on the criteria selected, and should serve to make us suspicious of *all* educational league tables (see League Table 4).

League Table 3 "Value Added": Mean Difference between Year 4 and Year 1

Univ.	Year 4	Year 1	Difference (Progress)	Position	Type
01	83.712	66.042	17.670	1st	ex-Poly
04	78.174	62.306	15.868	2nd	ex-Poly
08	78.711	65.329	13.382	3rd	ex-Poly
03	85.500	72.938	12.562	4th	ex-CAT
10	76.607	67.655	8.952	5th	ex-Poly
06	83.400	74.553	8.847	6th	Trad.
11	78.313	69.576	8.737	7th	ex-Poly
09	85.273	77.137	8.136	8th	Trad
12	75.333	71.884	3.449	9th	Trad

League Table 4 Table of Tables: shifting positions

	1 (Entrants)	2 (Graduands)	3 ("Value-Added")
01	10th	3rd	1st
03	4th	1st	4th
04	12th	7th	2nd
06	3rd	4th	6th
08	11th	5th	3rd
09	2nd	2nd	8th
10	9th	8th	5th
11	8th	6th	7th
12	5th	9th	9th

University 01, 10th on the quality of its entrants, tops the Value-Added chart. University 04, last in the recruitment stakes, comes second on learner progress, while University 08 climbs from 11th to 3rd. Conversely, University 09 drops from 2nd to 8th: it may attract high-flyers, but they don't appear to progress much further once they arrive.

Of course this is all nonsense. League Table 3 is as open to question as the others. The lower the entrance level, the easier it should be to show progress; the closer to perfection you get, the harder it is to improve, as athletes and slimmers know very well. What can the data *really* tell us?

6 Progress

It is clear from Table 2 that progress, as measured by mean C-Test scores in this cross-sectional study, is on average far slower between the start of year one and the start of year two than it is between the start of year two and the start of year four.

Table 2 **Mean proficiency differences between year groups**

Group	Year 2 — Year 1	Year 4 — Year 2
ALL	2.9%	8.8%
01	5.4%	12.3%
02	2.9%	
03	3.0%	9.5%
04	6.5%	9.4%
06	2.2%	6.6%
08	4.5%	8.9%
09	3.5%	4.6%
10	-5.6%	14.0%
11	-4.4%	13.2%
12	3.5%	8.3%

We need to recognise that column 3 represents 2 years as opposed to the single year of column 2; nonetheless, teachers' intuition is that students are often harder to motivate in year 2 and therefore make less progress than in their initial year, and there is evidence in the Oktobertest that, at least for students of German who were retested at the end of each year of study, this is so (Coleman 1995). Scores, out of a possible 110, rose between October and the following June by 16.2 points for year one students, 7.7 points for year two students, and 1.6 points for year four students. (The marginal improvement recorded for final-year students could be entirely accounted for by familiarity with the test and its procedures, and cannot be taken as evidence of any real progress whatsoever.) In other words, our data tend to confirm the feelings of language teachers everywhere, and the findings of a series of sometimes individually unsatisfying but cumulatively impressive discussions and studies of the issue (see James and Rouve 1973; Willis et al 1977; Dyson 1988; Evans 1988; Meara 1994a; Freed 1990; Freed 1995). Such studies have suggested that the period of residence abroad, which is now a compulsory element of

most modern language degrees in the British Isles, is of disproportionate importance to the improvement in the language proficiency of advanced learners.

If our proficiency study has done no more than show that students *do* make progress, albeit much more slowly at university than at school due to the ceiling effect; and that levels of proficiency within the British system are so disparate as to drain all meaning from a statement such as "Upper Second in Business Studies with French", it has at least drawn attention to issues which, despite political sensitivity, demand greater attention both at a policy and a research level. We have raised the question of the professional status of university language teachers, where, by an extraordinary historical irony, those who are trained and knowledgeable are almost invariably receiving less reward, in status and cash, than those who are neither trained in nor knowledgeable about the task they are carrying out. We have drawn attention to the lamentable inadequacy of the description of course objectives, of success criteria, and of levels of foreign language proficiency. We have demonstrated once again the need for an in-depth study of the role of residence abroad in advanced-level language study: such is, indeed, intended to be the next stage of our research programme, but our study will not be limited to matters of proficiency and progress, for the Oktobertest also produced interesting findings on the crucial, related question of student motivation.

7 Language learner motivation

Many language teachers expend a good deal of time and energy attempting to explain to colleagues in other disciplines the uniqueness of the language teaching-learning process. I have recently adduced the sheer mass of literature on the subject (Coleman 1994c) and the unique influence a change of location can have (Coleman 1995), but return always to the way psychological factors relating to the individual learner impact upon the success or otherwise of the learning process, and how this swells the number of variables involved in the process to almost unquantifiable dimensions.

One of the key variables is that of motivation. In a research programme which has been under way for nearly thirty years, Gardner and his collaborators have shed much light on how motivation can operate. Through factor analysis (for an explanation of this approach, see below and Woods, Fletcher and Hughes 1986), they identified two forms of orientation: integrative orientation (a sincere, positive interest in a people and culture

which use a different language) and instrumental orientation (a recognition of the practical benefits of learning a new language), which represent opposite ends of a continuum (Gardner and Lambert 1972).

Orientation may be distinct from the desire to learn another language, although it appears that integrative orientation serves to motivate the individual to acquire a second language. Only a sympathetic attitude towards the target group amounting to identification with it, it is argued, can provide sufficient motive for the persistence required for successful SLA. "The sustaining motivation appears to be one of group membership, and not of language acquisition per se" (Gardner and Lambert 1972, p.12). Orientations are linked to home background and parental attitudes, and their strength or intensity can vary considerably. Gardner and Lambert's 1972 study underlined the role played by variables such as learning context and the identity of the target language. Success was linked, for Canadians learning French in a bilingual community, to integrative orientation, but for Filipinos learning English as a Foreign Language, to instrumental orientation.

Until quite recently, the integrative/instrumental opposition has dominated research into the motivation of language learners, despite the fact that Gardner does not propose a strict bipolarity. Empirical findings have been inconclusive, sometimes contradictory, though, taken as a whole, they suggest in general terms a real but weak relationship between integrative orientation and successful language learning.

Schumann's acculturation model (Schumann 1978 1986), following in the Gardner-Lambert tradition, concerns learners of a *second* rather than a *foreign* language, i.e. learners who are in a community which use the language they seek to acquire — and this might be expected to apply to UK students spending a mandatory period of residence abroad. For Schumann, the social and psychological distance between the learner and the target community are key variables in the language acquisition process. Psychological distance encompasses language shock, the stress of culture chock, individual ego boundaries, and motivation — factors familiar to those who supervise year-abroad students.

It is possible for researchers to criticise such work either for blurring the traditional division of psychology of personality into three domains: cognition, motivation and affect; or for concentrating on social psychology rather than other sub-domains of the discipline. While SLA researchers have never in fact neglected aspects of personality such as extroversion/introversion, risk-taking, anxiety and ethnocentricity, Crookes and Schmidt (1991) are often credited with having reopened the research agenda. They suggest that SLA motivation has been too tied to *social* psy-

chology, and wish to expand it into educational psychology, using the term *motivation* in an everyday sense, with immediate pedagogical applications. Still more recently, Oxford and Shearin (1994) have sought to widen further the field of motivation to embrace not only educational psychology (including cognitive developmental psychology) but also industrial psychology, i.e. motivation which can be directly *influenced*. In their search for deeper stimuli, Gardner and Lambert had excluded from the concept "motivation" the explicit goals and rewards so characteristic of industrial psychology, and which may perhaps apply significantly to foreign language learners in formal educational contexts, especially in an essentially monolingual society such as the UK.

Motivation as a personality trait would not be expected to change rapidly, but as Oxford and Shearin (1994, p.14) note, students' reasons for learning a language do evolve. The study reported here was not a longitudinal one, but the substantial size of certain sub-samples does suggest that their views may be relatively typical of students at one particular stage of development. It is only in this sense that this cross-sectional study may be said to identify changing motivation.

Surveys of research on language learner motivation such as those of Skehan (1989, pp.49-72) and Ellis (1994, pp.508-17) stress that one key element is success: well-motivated classroom learners perceive their progress, are encouraged by it, and this in turn motivates further effort and further success, in a virtuous circle which many (e.g. McDonough 1986, pp.155, 159) see as the strongest motivation of all.

7.1 Motivation of university students

Setting aside half a dozen articles of indifferent quality, the most recent American contribution is a study by Roberts (1992) of non-specialist freshmen who included a modern language in their curriculum. According to Roberts, 80.6% of respondents listed among their motivations access to culture, in the broad social or narrower aesthetic sense, whereas only 47.7% mentioned using languages for business. Substantial allusions to travel, and to world peace and harmony far outweigh those to career skills: U.S. students seem to perceive language skills as cultural rather than vocational.

A qualitative study of fifty above-average British undergraduates (Evans 1988, pp.11-13) highlights the influence of earlier experiences (family links, teachers, trips abroad), but stresses the importance both of previous classroom success and of an enjoyment of the language per se in motivating their continued study. Singleton and Singleton (1992) identified a similar blend of motivations among Irish learners of Spanish and

French. They found instrumentally oriented motivations such as career ambitions counterbalanced by integratively oriented motivations such as a desire to live in the target community and to get to know its culture and literature. They also identified a wish to acquire specific language skills, and a broader interest in Europe which may have been influenced by the enhanced integration of the European Union, in which 1992 was a key date. Data collected from 586 British undergraduates in 1986 and analysed by Meara (1993, 1994a, 1994b) does not focus specifically on reasons for language study, but responses concerning target skills suggest the sample group placed linguistic skills above cultural ones, with work-related objectives in last position.

7.2 Data elicitation in the Oktobertest

Question 21 of the Oktobertest questionnaire asked "What are your main reasons for studying this language? Put an X in the box by up to six answers". The list offered was as follows, although, for the purposes of this article, we have added a one-word summary for each:

- to get to know the people who speak it (*L2landers*[1])
- for your future career (*career*)
- to travel in different countries (*travel*)
- to become a better-educated person (*education*)
- because you liked the teacher (*teacher*)
- to have a better understanding of the way of life in the country or countries where it is spoken (*way-of-life*)
- because it is an international language (*lingua-franca*)
- because your friends were doing it (*friends*)
- because your parents wanted you to (*parents*)
- because you were good at it (*success*)
- because of family ties with the country (*family*)
- because you like the language (*like-the-language*)
- because people respect you more if you speak other languages (*respect*)
- to meet a greater variety of people in your life (*socialising*)

---

1 Since the project already concerns students in six countries learning seven foreign languages, we needed to develop a shorthand to replace "a country or countries where the language you are being tested on is spoken": it became "L2land" and its inhabitants "L2landers". By extension, a student's home country and compatriots are "L1land" and "L1landers" respectively. The terms are open to criticism, not least because they ignore distinctions between second and foreign language learning, but they have proved very convenient in use.

- because you would like to live in a country where it is spoken (*residence*)
- other reasons (please specify)[2]

One has, of course, to accept the limitations of questionnaires as a means of data elicitation: respondents may give answers that are more socially acceptable, self-flattering or artificially consistent than the reality; but questionnaires provide a more practical access to motivations (which are themselves not directly observable) than does extended observation and analysis of behaviour.

7.3 Rank order of UK student motivation — evolution of choices

Table 3 Percentages of UK students of French citing reasons for study (rank order)

Reason given	All years (N=1867)[3]	Year One (N=715)	Year Two (N=739)	Year Four (N=313)
Career	81.6	85.6	80.9	73.5
Like-the-language	80.1	81.0	78.5	84.3
Travel	65.1	67.6	64.4	61.3
Success	53.1	54.7	53.2	55.0
Residence	51.3	54.3	52.2	44.7
Way-of-life	47.3	50.9	45.1	48.2
Lingua franca	38.3	37.3	40.9	33.9
Education	37.9	40.1	36.4	36.7
Socialising	33.6	35.4	32.5	32.6
L2landers	24.3	22.5	22.1	33.2
Respect	8.8	9.2	8.8	5.8
Family	6.8	7.0	5.4	9.6
Parents	2.1	1.5	2.1	1.6
Teacher	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.9
Friends	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.3

2 Of over 3000 respondents, only 22 chose to add their own reason. Of these, only three (one British student of Russian, one German student of French, one school pupil) mentioned literature. As Meara remarks in the context of the Nuffield survey, "The consensus that exists among language teachers about the reasons for learning and teaching languages may not in fact be shared by those that they teach" (1994a, p.37).

3 Totals in columns 2-4 do not add up to the total in column 1 because students in Year 3 have been omitted.

We look first at UK students of French (the largest cohort), German, and Spanish (Tables 3-6): the Spanish students are divided into two groups since at University A they spend the second year abroad, while University B follows the more common pattern of sending them abroad in the third year.

Table 4 **Percentages of UK students of German citing reasons for study (rank order)**

Reason given	All years (N=124)	Year One (N=44)	Year Two (N=45)	Year Four (N=35)
Career	80.6	86.4	86.7	65.7
Like-the language	69.4	72.7	66.7	68.6
Travel	61.3	63.6	66.7	51.4
Way-of-life	58.9	47.7	64.4	65.7
Residence	50.8	56.8	60.0	31.4
Success	50.0	50.0	46.7	54.3
Lingua franca	43.5	47.7	46.7	34.3
Education	39.5	25.0	46.7	48.6
Socialising	38.7	47.7	17.8	54.3
L2landers	20.2	18.2	13.3	31.4
Family	19.4	18.2	20.0	20.0
Respect	12.1	18.2	8.9	8.6
Teacher	1.6	2.3	0.0	2.9
Parents	0.8	2.3	0.0	0.0
Friends	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5	Percentages of UK students of Spanish (University A) citing reasons for study (rank order)			
Reason given	**All years (N=229)**	**Year One (N=88)**	**Year Two (N=75)**	**Year Four (N=61)**
Career	76.4	84.1	70.7	70.5
Like-the-language	70.3	69.3	65.3	77.0
Way-of-life	69.9	75.0	65.3	67.2
Travel	67.7	76.1	53.3	70.5
Residence	55.5	56.8	56.0	54.1
Lingua franca	41.9	39.8	41.3	44.3
Socialising	41.9	46.6	30.7	44.3
Education	34.5	33.0	36.0	37.7
L2landers	35.4	31.8	38.7	34.4
Success	23.6	18.2	29.3	24.6
Family	18.3	12.5	20.0	26.2
Respect	6.6	4.5	10.7	4.9
Teacher	1.7	1.1	4.0	0.0
Parents	0.9	0.0	1.3	1.6
Friends	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.0

Table 6 **Percentages of UK students of Spanish (University B) citing reasons for study (rank order)**

Reason given	All years (N=166)[4]	Year One (N=63)	Year Two (N=68)	Year Four (N=33)
Like-the-language	78.9	81.0	75.8	78.8
Career	74.7	74.6	77.3	69.7
Travel	73.5	77.8	71.2	72.7
Way-of-life	59.4	63.5	56.1	60.6
Residence	52.4	54.0	45.5	66.7
Socialising	45.8	57.1	40.9	36.4
Lingua-franca	44.6	39.7	43.9	51.5
Success	37.3	34.9	36.4	45.5
L2landers	32.5	28.6	28.8	45.5
Education	28.9	28.6	31.8	18.2
Family	9.6	9.5	7.6	12.1
Respect	5.4	1.6	9.1	6.1
Teacher	2.4	1.6	3.0	3.0
Parents	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Friends	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

7.4 Common factors in the motivations of British language students

As might have been expected, what emerges is a combination of the integrative, the instrumental, the resultative and the simply self-indulgent. *Career* considerations are the most important factor for most groups, being cited by three students out of four. A liking for the language comes a very close second, with a rating of 70% or more. For students of Spanish at University B (Span-B for short), *like-the-language* precedes *career*; while for students of German the gap between *career* and *like-the-language* is rather wider. *Travel* is consistently in third or fourth place, with a rating of between 61% and 74%. *Way-of-life* scores 59-60% with two groups, but nearly 70% for Span-A and only 47% among students of French.

4 The total includes two third-year students who do not figure in the subsequent columns.

A desire to live in L2land motivates just over half the students in all groups. The resultative motivation ("nothing succeeds like success") is the only other motivation cited by a majority of students of French and German: the far lower ratings from students of Spanish may well reflect the number of *ab initio* learners, especially at university A.

Over 40% of each group sees the international role of their target language as important, and a similar proportion (34%-46%) see it as a way of meeting a wider variety of people. Language learning as an essential feature of a good *education* scores for around 29%-40% of each group.

Perhaps surprisingly, fewer than one in four learners of French and German opt for an interest in *L2landers* as one of their principal motivations. Although this proportion rises to around one-third for learners of Spanish, it is in all cases far below *way-of-life*. Why should British students think target-community individuals are less interesting to get to know than their way of life? Does the academic (sociological, area-studies) motivation dominate the social one? Might this indicate a selfish, perhaps naive desire to enjoy the positive aspects of another country (food, landscape, culture, etc.) without becoming involved with its inhabitants? — we have all overheard comments on the lines of "France is a wonderful country, with so much to offer — pity about the people!". Might it suggest a diffidence or lack of confidence on the part of British students, who all, in a different section of the questionnaire, rated their particular L2landers as more confident and less shy than the British? This is a finding which, in my view, would reward further research using a different methodology.

Language students have more family links with speakers of other languages than one might expect to find in the general population. There is considerable variation across groups, with one in five of the students of German citing family ties as a principal motivation, and a slightly higher tendency among older students to mention family connections.

The figures for *respect*, all below 10% with the exception of students of German, might be viewed as disappointing (society does not respect foreign language proficiency) or reassuring (it is perfectly normal these days to speak another language, no big deal), or as indicating that our students rely more on themselves than on what others think: a low Sartrian *pour-autrui* rating. Certainly, few of them feel (or will admit) they have been influenced in their choice by someone else, whether parents, teacher or friends.

7.5 Differences of emphasis between successive years of study

Although it is not, strictly speaking, legitimate to speak of evolu-

tion when analysing cross-sectional data, it is hard to resist the temptation to view differences between year-groups in any other light, especially where the differences are shared across several target-language groups.

It is important, firstly, to note the relative stability of the motivations cited by all four groups. The biggest differences are to be found in the smallish sample of learners of German (especially on *career, travel, residence* and *socialising*). Elsewhere, only on *career* and *residence* are there marked shifts of 10 percentage points or more within two or more target-language groups.

The evidence on career motivation is clear: it remains one of the strongest motivations, but its importance *decreases* as students mature, and by year four, *for all student groups*, it is *less* important than their liking for the language. The evidence from Span-A, who spend year two abroad, reinforces the conclusion that it is residence abroad which triggers the biggest change in students' feelings about the career value of their language study. The same group provides evidence that for some students at least (cf. students of German), residence abroad assuages the yearning for travel — though not permanently.

Responses on *residence* vary across target languages. Among learners of French, and especially among learners of German, the proportion of those wishing to live in L2land drops sharply once they have. This might simply mean that respondents in years one and two had course requirements in mind as they filled in question 21, but data from question 22, which explored attitudes to L2landers and which is to be published elsewhere, also suggests that students' experiences during compulsory residence in France and Germany may well leave them with a more negative view of the country and its people than they had before their extended and intimate involvement with the community. By contrast, the desire of Span-A to live in a hispanophone country remains stable, and that of Span-B is heartily reinforced by familiarity.

More encouraging for Francophones and Germanists is the accrued interest fourth-year students have in L2landers themselves, which, while remaining modest, shows a marked increase for students of all languages (though with the exception of Span-A).

While final-year students of German are less likely than their younger counterparts to acknowledge its international importance, both groups of students of Spanish appear to acquire increasing recognition of the language's international role.

7.6 European comparisons

In addition to the four groups previously identified, the questionnaire was administered, with a C-Test, to a small group of British students of Russian (including 45 university students), and, in German translation, to students studying English or French at three universities in Austria and Northern Germany. The Austrian students were specialising in international business. Given the different structure of degree courses outside the UK, no data are here given for year of study (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7 **Cross-group comparison of responses in questionnaire order**

	UK FR (N=1867)	UK GE (N=124)	UK SP A (N=229)	UK SP B (N=166)	UK R (N=45)	D FR (N=130)	D ENG (N=42)	A ENG (N=110)
L2landers	24.3	20.2	35.4	32.5	42.2	50.8	54.8	23.6
Career	81.6	80.6	76.4	74.7	75.6	46.2	35.7	63.6
Travel	65.1	61.3	67.7	73.5	71.1	48.5	45.2	54.5
Education	37.9	39.5	34.5	28.9	48.9	53.1	45.2	61.8
Teacher	1.3	1.6	1.7	2.4	2.2	5.4	2.4	0.0
Way-of-life	47.3	58.9	69.9	59.4	62.2	54.6	61.9	20.9
Lingua franca	38.3	43.5	41.9	44.6	13.3	50.8	69.0	80.0
Friends	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.4	0.0
Parents	2.1	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	1.8
Success	53.1	50.0	23.6	37.3	13.3	29.2	38.1	20.9
Family	6.8	19.4	18.3	9.6	2.2	6.2	11.9	3.6
Like-the-language	80.1	69.4	70.3	78.9	75.6	90.0	71.4	51.8
Respect	8.8	12.1	6.6	5.4	8.9	2.3	2.4	7.3
Socialising	33.6	38.7	41.9	45.8	35.6	28.5	33.3	22.7
Residence	51.3	50.8	55.5	52.4	24.4	36.9	45.2	27.3

The Austrian students are clearly aware of the vocational role of their choice of subject, though less so than British students. *Like-the-language* is important for no fewer than 90% of German students of French, and also comes top for German students of English. The two groups studying Eng-

Table 8 **Principal motivations of all groups of European language students, with percentages, in rank order**

	UK FR	UK GE	UK SP A	UK SP B	UK R	D FR	D ENG	A ENG
1	Career	Career	Career	Like-the-language	Career = Like-the-language	Like-the-language	Like-the-language	Lingua franca
	81.6	80.6	76.4	78.9	75.6	90.0	71.4	80.0
2	Like-the-language	Like-the-language	Like-the-language	Career		Way of life	Lingua franca	Career
	80.1	69.4	70.3	74.7		54.6	69.0	63.6
3	Travel	Travel	Way-of-life	Travel	Travel	Education	Way-of-life	Education
	65.1	61.3	69.9	73.5	71.1	53.1	61.9	61.8
4	Success	Way-of-life	Travel	Way-of-life	Way-of-life	L2landers = Lingua franca	L2landers	Travel
	53.1	58.9	67.7	59.4	62.2	50.8	54.8	54.5
5	Residence	Residence	Residence	Residence	Education		Travel = Education = Residence	Like-the-language
	51.3	50.8	55.5	52.4	48.9		45.2	51.8
6	Way-of-life	Success	Lingua franca = Socialising	Socialising	L2landers	Travel		Residence
	47.3	50.0	41.9	45.8	42.2	48.5		27.3

lish not unexpectedly see it above all as a *lingua-franca*, but the German students of French are also more aware of the international role of their chosen target language than are any of the UK students. The motivation of the Austrian business students comes across as highly instrumental in nature, with low scores on integrative choices, dramatically so for *way-of-life*. The Germans, on the other hand, for whom career concerns came in seventh and ninth positions respectively, seem to have chosen their subjects rather on the basis of an integrative orientation and a personal liking for the language.

Language learning is less tied to travel for the continental Europeans than it is for the British, but is rather more closely linked by them to notions of a good education. The continental students also have less desire to live in the target community than any of the British students, with the exception of those studying Russian. Of all the groups, the German students of French are the most willing to admit to their choice having been influenced by parent or teacher, although still only one in twenty of them will own up. The *success* motive, recognised by half of British students of French and German, comes predictably low on the list where *ab initio* learners are concerned, but is also less of a factor for the German and Austrian students. The British students of Russian manifest greater interest in the people and way of life of their target community, but have less desire to take up residence there.

One might characterise these results by saying that British students, with their mixture of integrative and instrumental motivations, come halfway between the Austrian business students, with their hard-headed vocational approach to English, and the German students, for whom university study is more a matter of doing what you enjoy.

7.7 Learner motivation and age: UK students of French

Within the largest sample of respondents, UK learners of French, options selected in question 21 were compared to individuals' age and sex, to see whether any facets of motivation might vary systematically. To accentuate age differences, the members of the groups analysed in Table 9 overlap, and students aged 20 or 21 have been omitted.

Career and *like-the-language* continue to dominate student choices, at whatever age. However, the instrumental *career* choice loses popularity while *like-the-language* remains stable. Travel, which we see as a predominantly instrumental choice (see below, but cf. Singleton and Singleton 1992, p.4), becomes less significant, while two key integrative options (*way-of-life* and *L2landers*) are more likely to be selected by older students, who also have a relatively higher level of family links to the target lan-

guage. The desire for others' *respect* falls further, while the desire for a good general *education* rises above 50%. There is a falling desire to live in France, whether from disillusionment, restricted choices imposed by family commitments, or a narrow reading of the question it is impossible to say. The resultant *success* motive tails right off. It is clear that age is related to the type of motivation students claim to have.

Table 9 **Percentage of each age group selecting a particular motivation, in questionnaire order**

Motivation selected	All (N=1867)	Age 18 or below (N=343)	Age 19 or below (N=923)	Age 22 or more (N=387)	Age 23 or more (N=246)	Age 24 or more (N=195)
L2landers	24.3	20.7	20.0	33.8	34.6	36.9
Career	81.6	88.0	85.7	74.9	72.8	72.3
Travel	65.1	71.7	70.3	57.4	52.4	50.3
Education	37.9	39.1	36.2	44.6	48.0	50.8
Teacher	1.3	1.2	0.8	1.8	1.6	1.5
Way-of-life	47.3	48.1	46.5	51.5	57.3	58.5
Lingua franca	38.3	37.3	37.4	41.8	40.2	39.0
Friends	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.8	1.0
Parents	2.1	0.9	1.6	1.3	2.0	2.1
Success	53.1	58.9	56.9	42.3	35.8	31.8
Family	6.8	5.0	5.1	9.5	9.3	9.2
Like-the-language	80.1	82.8	81.0	78.2	78.9	77.4
Respect	8.8	9.3	9.4	7.2	7.3	6.7
Socialising	33.6	35.0	34.9	33.8	35.4	35.4
Residence	51.3	56.3	54.3	46.2	47.2	45.1

7.8 Learner motivation and sex: UK students of French

Male students are slightly more likely to have *family* reasons for studying French (see Table 10), and are more likely than female students to opt for the two reasons allied to social status (*education* and *respect*). Females are slightly more likely to select the motivations involving social activities (*travel*, *way-of-life* and *socialising*). On the most significant choices,

however, there is no real distinction to be made between male and female students.

Table 10 **Percentages of males and females selecting each response**

	Males		Females	
Overall sample	27.8	(514)	72.2	(1337)
L2landers	28.8	(130)	71.2	(321)
Career	25.4	(384)	74.6	(1126)
Travel	24.6	(296)	75.4	(909)
Education	31.4	(221)	68.6	(482)
Teacher	40.0	(10)	60.0	(15)
Way-of-life	24.7	(218)	75.3	(663)
Lingua franca	27.3	(193)	72.7	(515)
Friends	75.0	(6)	25.0	(2)
Parents	31.6	(12)	68.4	(26)
Success	30.0	(295)	70.0	(688)
Family	34.4	(43)	65.6	(82)
Like-the-language	25.7	(381)	74.3	(1104)
Respect	33.3	(54)	66.7	(108)
Socialising	24.5	(153)	75.5	(472)
Residence	27.3	(259)	72.7	(691)

8 Factors underlying language learner motivation: principal components and factor analyses

In studying the factors which differentiate between individuals, it is often helpful to simplify, to find patterns of correlations in data which reduce their complexity. In statistical studies, this means replacing existing variables with fewer, new variables, just as we do when representing a decathlete's performances in individual events by a single points total, or, in a less scientific domain, reducing a graduand's performance in a range of subjects over several years to a single degree classification. Two techniques for simplifying multivariate data in this way are principal

components (PC) analysis and factor analysis (FA). The distinctions between the two procedures, and the variations within each, are too complex to be considered here, and the mathematically literate are referred for a summary to Woods, Fletcher and Hughes (1986, pp.273-95). Both procedures were applied to data derived from responses of learners of French to Question 21 of the October 1993 survey.

Table 11 **Factor Analysis (FA)**

	FA1	FA2	FA3	FA4	FA5	FA6	FA7
L2landers	.4604	.3355	.0844	-.2136	.1020	.0437	.2234
Career	-.0456	.0810	.0145	.7228	.2064	-.1381	.0711
Travel	.2880	.1683	-.0136	.5699	-.1685	.3944	-.0379
Education	.0605	-.6559	-.0235	.0023	.1084	-.1314	.0655
Teacher	-.0278	-.0131	.0214	-.0508	.0465	.7892	-.0070
Way-of-life	.5689	.0525	-.0815	-.0677	.0863	-.2548	-.1799
Lingua franca	-.2429	-.4459	.0110	.4558	-.0903	-.0481	-.0198
Friends	.0441	.0350	.7637	-.0051	.0273	.1405	.0787
Parents	-.1051	-.0423	.7765	.0134	-.0565	-.1199	-.0721
Success	-.4643	.0063	-.0618	-.1396	.5275	.2968	.0106
Family	-.2273	.2247	-.0198	-.0040	-.3160	-.0771	-.4988
Like-the-language	.1033	.0324	-.0096	.1253	.7866	-.0564	-.0561
Respect	-.1960	.0440	-.0097	.0466	-.1917	-.0568	.8244
Socialising	.5910	-.1473	-.0458	.0736	-.0261	.1777	.0014
Residence	-.0275	.6803	-.0445	.1737	.1047	-.1901	-.0217

The factor analysis, using varimax rotation, gave the results shown in Table 11.

The first factor (FA1) is integrative, with heavy loadings on *socialising*, *way-of-life* and *L2landers*, contrasting strongly with *success*. Factor FA2 is dominated by *residence*, with loading also on *L2landers*, and to some extent on *family* and *travel*: this is a want-to-live-there factor, whose personal-preference motive is clearly contrasted to the more calculatingly instrumental motives *education* and *lingua-franca*.

Factor FA3 relates to the influence of others. Factor FA4 is heavily instrumental, with a massive loading on *career*, supported by professional

travel and (quite logically) by *lingua-franca*. Factor FA5, loading on *like-the-language* and *success*, again brings out the circularity of liking the language because one is good at it, and being good at it because one likes it. But here the language is apparently viewed *as a discipline*, and without connection to the people who speak it or the lands where they live. The existence of such a decontextualised language-specific factor is itself of great interest.[5] Factor FA6, loading essentially on *teacher* but with some loading on *travel* and *success* suggests that teachers are influential not just in student subject choices but also, not unexpectedly, in shaping student attitudes. The final factor (FA7) loads highly on *respect*. Although not reported here in detail, the Principal Components Analysis gave similar results.

In summary, the two approaches to reducing the dimensionality of multivariate data have suggested some dominant elements within students' motivation for learning foreign languages:

- Firstly, there is a social-psychological element close to Gardner and Lambert's integrative orientation. This appears to comprise both a desire to get to know L2landers and their way of life, and a (probably separable) desire to live among them. Its subjectivity contrasts with the objective judgment that French should be studied because it is an international language whose acquisition makes one a better-educated person.
- Secondly, there is a liking for the language itself which is reinforced by success in learning it. This motivation may be entirely distinct from any attitude to L2landers, and is closer to an instrumental than to an integrative orientation.
- Thirdly, there is a career orientation supported by a recognition that French is an international language.
- Fourthly, a desire to travel is linked to both an international career and to integrative orientation, though loading more heavily on instrumental factors. A question designed to differentiate between how and why respondents want to travel would be desirable for future research in this area. One might envisage a continuum, with two weeks with a singles club in Ibiza at one end and a year with the Tuareg at the other; or more simply business travel and leisure/cultural travel.

---

5 It might be speculated that those scoring highly on this factor might be more intelligent, might do well on traditional courses emphasising grammar rules and a problem-solving approach, might have negative feelings about reidence abroad and benefit less from it, might do better , in the useful terms adopted by Cummins (1981) at CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) than at BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills: for concise definitions of each see Ellis 1994: 694). But the C-Test is inadequate to test such speculation

- Finally, some students are influenced by parents, friends or teachers.

The relationship between liking the language and instrumental motivation remains problematical, as does the precise interpretation of a desire to travel, but it may be hoped that these findings will inform future research design in this area.

9 Relationships between motivation and proficiency

In seeking correlations between types of motivation, as identified by question 21, and general proficiency in French, as measured by the C-Test, we must take care with the response *travel* since we have shown that a desire to travel may be occasioned by opposing motives: it appears, however, to be more closely linked with professional aspirations than with social-psychological orientation.

In accordance, therefore, with the global factors identified above, we grouped students of French, within each year of study, by various types of motivation (see Table 12):

- success-in-class: *success* + *like-the-language*
- integrative: *L2landers* + *way-of-life*
- *L2landers* + *way-of-life* + *socialising*
- *L2landers* + *way-of-life* + *socialising* + *like-the-language*
- *L2landers* + *way-of-life* + *like-the-language* + *residence*
- *L2landers* + *residence*
- instrumental: *career* + *lingua-franca*
- instrumental + travel: *career* + *travel* + *lingua-franca*
- influenced: *friends* + *parents*

Two further approaches were adopted (see Table 13): mean scores for those selecting each single response to question 21, and mean scores for those adopting an integrative selection (any three of *L2landers*, *way-of-life*, *like-the-language* and *residence*) or an instrumental selection (any three of *career*, *travel*, *education*, *lingua-franca* and *respect*).

The analysis of the relationships between types of student motivation and C-Test scores is of course limited since there is no measure of *strength* of motivation, but some tentative conclusions may be drawn. The first finding from Table 12 is rather tautological: successful advanced language learners are those who are motivated by being successful language learners (*success* + *like-the-language* group). More precisely, among advanced classroom learners it appears to be a *classroom* factor in their motivation which best predicts their level of language proficiency. It is also worth noting just what a high proportion of language learners with this combination of motivations are to be found in university classrooms. This find-

Table 12 **Mean scores of students with different motivations (N in brackets)**

Year of study	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
All students	70.4	73.3	82.1
	(715)	(739)	(313)
success + like-the-language	72.4	76.0	83.3
	(330)	(326)	(151)
L2landers + way of life	71.6	72.7	83.7
	(97)	(86)	(61)
career + travel + lingua franca	69.1	70.7	82.4
	(161)	(169)	(48)
career + lingua franca	68.9	70.8	81.9
	(234)	(261)	(83)
L2landers + way of life + socialising	69.6	74.0	83.2
+ like the language	(18)	(11)	(10)
L2landers + way of life + like the language	70.1	71.6	85.8
+ residence	(41)	(38)	(23)
L2landers + way of life + socialising	70.7	74.0	84.4
	(41)	(34)	(25)
L2landers + residence	70.3	72.8	82.2
	(91)	(96)	(52)
friends + parents	66.0	75.7	--
	(1)	(3)	

Table 13 **Mean scores for individual and group selections (N in brackets)**

Year of study:	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
L2landers	71.5	(161)	74.0	(163)	82.4	(104)
career	70.2	(612)	72.7	(598)	82.1	(230)
travel	70.3	(483)	72.6	(476)	82.7	(192)
education	68.6	(287)	72.2	(269)	81.5	(115)
teacher	70.6	(9)	70.8	(8)	85.0	(6)
way of life	71.7	(364)	73.7	(333)	82.9	(151)
lingua franca	69.2	(267)	71.1	(302)	82.1	(106)
friends	75.0	(2)	73.8	(5)	97.0	(1)
parents	70.4	(11)	70.4	(21)	81.4	(5)
success	72.3	(391)	75.7	(393)	83.2	(172)
family	72.3	(50)	77.2	(40)	82.2	(30)
like the language	70.6	(579)	73.4	(580)	82.1	(264)
respect	70.2	(66)	69.4	(65)	79.2	(18)
socialising	70.2	(253)	72.8	(240)	83.3	(102)
residence	70.4	(388)	72.8	(386)	82.7	(140)
3 of *L2landers, way of life, like the language, residence*	71.4	(235)	73.5	(236)	82.8	(116)
3 of *career, travel, education, lingua franca respect*	68.8	(305)	70.9	(322)	81.3	(98)

ing is not, of course, without pedagogical implications: if teaching, testing and marking can reinforce students' self-perception as successful language learners, they will help them to be so.

Secondly, an integrative motivation or orientation (*L2landers + way-of-life* group) appears to be more clearly linked to successful foreign language acquisition among university learners than is an instrumental motivation (*career + lingua-franca* and *career + travel + lingua-franca* groups). Thirdly, as would be expected, extended residence abroad diminishes the distinctions, which are in any event not very marked.

The individual responses in Table 13 tell a similar tale. For both Year 1 and Year 2 students (excluding *teacher, friends* and *parents* for which the sample is unrepresentatively small), the highest achievers are those selecting *success* (good at French) and *family* (family links with France). By Year 4, the *success*-selectors are still doing well, but, within a far more homogeneous range of scores, they are marginally bettered by *socialising*-selectors.

Averaging the mean scores on *L2landers* and *way-of-life* (integrative), *career* and *lingua-franca* (instrumental) and *career, travel* and *lingua-franca* (instrumental including travel) — see Table 14 — suggests once again that, even at university level, a predominantly integrative motivation is linked to higher achievement than is a predominantly instrumental one, with travel located between the two but towards the instrumental end of the continuum. The differences are again diminished for those who have lived abroad.

Table 14 **Averages of mean scores for those selecting individual responses**

Year of study:	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**
L2landers + way of life	71.6	73.9	82.7
career + lingua franca	69.7	71.9	82.1
career + travel + lingua franca	69.9	72.1	82.3

The final point of interest from the individual choices is that neither a liking for the language (*like-the-language*) nor a desire to immigrate (*residence*) is in itself a predictor of higher achievement.

The comparison between the integrative selection (any three of *L2landers, way-of-life, like-the-language* and *residence*) and the instrumental

selection (any three of *career, travel, education, lingua-franca* and *respect*) points again to the conclusion that students with a mainly integrative motivation will out-perform students with a mainly instrumental motivation, although this effect will be less marked once students have spent an extended period in L2land.

Learners of Spanish and German The above conclusions are confirmed by the smaller samples of students of Spanish (universities A and B) and German who completed the same questionnaire with an appropriate C-Test (see Table 15). Unlike the majority of students, A-Span go abroad in Year 2.

Table 15 **Mean scores of learners of Spanish and German with integrative/instrumental orientation**

Group	Motivation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
A-Span	3 of *L2landers, way of life, like the language, residence*	59.8 (39)	80.2 (36)	82.0 (29)
A-Span	3 of *career, travel, education, lingua franca, respect*	50.4 (40)	80.2 (30)	82.4 (19)
B-Span	3 of *L2landers, way of life like the language, residence*	67.7 (25)	82.2 (20)	82.1 (15)
B-Span	3 of *career, travel, education, lingua franca, respect*	63.0 (20)	63.4 (34)	84.6 (12)
German	3 of *L2landers, way of life, like the language, residence*	55.5 (14)	70.8 (17)	81.2 (12)
German	3 of *career, travel, education, lingua franca, respect*	55.0 (21)	66.5 (21)	79.1 (12)

For A-Span, the motivational distinction operates only for Year 1; for B-Span, it operates in Year 1 and spectacularly so in Year 2; while for the students of German it operates above all in Year 2. In each case, residence abroad appears to negate the effect of motivational differences.

Overall, it seems that motivation type, at this advanced proficiency level, *does* remain a predictive factor, though not an overwhelmingly powerful one as compared to duration of L2land residence, year of study, length of study, number of L2land visits, age, and even "A"-level grade

(see Coleman 1995). Within motivations, classroom success and an integrative orientation are the best predictors of language proficiency levels, but distinctions are less sharp once students have lived in the target country.

10 Conclusion

The conclusions on proficiency, progress and motivation drawn from the Oktobertest data may be reinforced or refined by new data. In the third stage of the survey, currently under way, the C-Test, accompanied by a revised and expanded questionnaire, is being administered to over twenty thousand students in six EU countries. The survey, a joint research project of the Universities of Portsmouth, Duisburg and Bochum, has received funding from the Commission of the European Communities under its LINGUA programme, and from the British Council and the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst under their Academic Research Collaboration Programme. The research team is grateful to its funders and to staff and students who have participated in all stages of the survey. Institutions and individuals cannot be identified for reasons of confidentiality, but without them there could be no research data.

References

Coleman, J. A., 1984: "Requiem for the prose? The disappointing reality behind the cherished ideals", *Modern Languages in Scotland* 29 (January 1986), pp.98-105.

Coleman, J. A., 1994a: "Degrees of proficiency: assessing the progress and achievement of university language learners", *French Studies Bulletin* 50, pp.11-16.

Coleman, J. A., 1994b: "Profiling the advanced language learner: the C-Test in British further and higher education". In R. Grotjahn (ed.), *Der C-Test. Theoretische Grundlagen und praktische Anwendungen*, vol.2, pp.217-37. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Coleman, J. A., 1994c: "Language teaching, language learning, language testing". Inaugural professorial lecture, University of Portsmouth.

Coleman, J. A., 1995: "A comparative survey of the proficiency and progress of language learners in British universities". In R. Grotjahn (ed.), *Der C-Test*, vol. 3, in press. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Crookes, G., and R. W. Schmidt, 1991: "Motivation: reopening the research agenda", *Language Learning* 41.4, pp.469-512.

Cummins, J., 1981: *Bilingualism and Minority Children*. Ontario: Ontario

Institute for Studies in Education.

Dyson, P., 1988: *The Year Abroad. The effect on linguistic competence of the year spent abroad by students studying French, German and Spanish at degree level*. Oxford University Language Teaching Centre.

Ellis, R., 1994: *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, C., 1988: *Language People*. Open University Press.,

Freed, B., 1990: "Language learning in a study abroad context: the effects of interactive and non-interactive out-of-class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency". In J. Atlatis (ed.), *Linguistics, Language Teaching and Language Acquisition: The Interdependence of Theory, Practice and Research*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Freed, B., 1995: "Language learning and study abroad". In B. Freed (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context*. John Benjamins.

Gardner, R., and W. Lambert, 1972: *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Gomes da Costa, B., et al., 1975: *German Language Attainment. A Sample Survey of Universities and Colleges in the U.K.* Heidelberg: Julius Groos.

Grotjahn, R., 1995: *Der C-Test. Theoretische Grundlagen und praktische Anwendungen*, vol. 3. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

HEQC, 1994: *Learning from Audit*. Higher Education Quality Council.

James, C. V., and S. Rouve, 1973: *Survey of Curricula and Performance in Modern Languages, 1971–72*. Brighton: University of Sussex, Centre for Educational Technology and London: CILT.

McDonough, S. H., 1986: *Psychology in Foreign Language Teaching*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge,

Meara, P., 1993: "What do students do on a language course?", *Language Learning Journal* 8, pp.26-31.

Meara, P., 1994a: "What should language graduates be able to do?", *Language Learning Journal* 9, pp.36-40.

Meara, P., 1994b: "The year abroad and its effects", *Language Learning Journal* 10, pp.32-38.

Oxford, R., and J. Shearin, 1994: "Language learning motivation: expanding the theoretical framework", *Modern Language Journal* 78.1, pp.12-28.

Roberts, L. P., 1992: "Attitudes of entering university freshmen toward foreign language study: a descriptive analysis, *Modern Language Journal* 76, pp.273-283.

Schumann, J., 1978: "The acculturation model for second language acquisition". In R. C. Gingras (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schumann, J., 1986: "Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition", *Journal of Multilingual and Muilticultural Development* 7, pp.379-392.

Singleton, D., and E. Singleton, 1992: *University-level learners of Spanish in Ireland*. CLCS Occasional Paper No.35. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

Skehan, P., 1989: *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. London: Arnold.

Spolsky, B., 1989: *Conditions for Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, G., 1993: *Survey of European Languages in the United Kingdom*. London: CNAA.

Willis, F., et al., 1977: *Residence Abroad and the Student of Modern Languages: A Preliminary Survey*. Bradford: University of Bradford, Modern Languages Centre.

Woods, A., P. Fletcher and A. Hughes, 1986: *Statistics in Language Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

© James A. Coleman

19. Meriel Bloor & Thomas Bloor, *Languages for specific purposes: practice and theory* (34pp.)

Spring 1988

20. D. G. Little & D. M. Singleton, *Authentic materials and the role of fixed support in language teaching: towards a manual for language learners* (26pp.)

Spring 1989

21. Seán M. Devitt, *Classroom discourse: its nature and its potential for language learning* (72pp.)

22. V. J. Cook, *The relevance of grammar in the applied linguistics of language teaching* (43pp.)

Spring 1990

23. Sera De Vriendt & Pete Van de Craen, *Bilingualism in Belgium: a history and an appraisal* (52pp.)

24. David Singleton, *The cross-linguistic factor in second language learning: a report on some small-scale studies recently conducted at the CLCS* (20pp.)

Autumn 1990

25. Paul Farrell, *Vocabulary in ESP: a lexical analysis of the English of electronics and a study of semi-technical vocabulary* (82pp.)

26. David Singleton, *The TCD Modern Languages Research Project: objectives, instruments and preliminary results* (19pp.)

27. Federica Scarpa, *Contrastive analysis and second language learners' errors: an analysis of C-test data elicited from beginners in Italian* (47pp.)

Spring 1991

28. Jennifer Ridley, *Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners* (95pp.)

29. Susan Abbey, *A case for on-going evaluation in English language teaching projects* (43pp.)

Spring 1992

30. Frank Donoghue, *Teachers' guides: a review of their function* (51pp.)

31. Barbara Byrne, *Relevance Theory and the language of advertising* (76pp.)

Summer 1992

32. Jonathan West, *The development of a functional-notional syllabus for university German courses* (50pp.)

33. James Mannes Bourke, *The case for problem solving in second language learning* (23pp.)

Autumn 1992

34. Tom Hopkins, *Intertextuality: a discussion, with particular reference to* The Waste Land (28pp.)

35. David Singleton & Emer Singleton, *University-level learners of Spanish in Ireland: a profile based on data from the TCD Modern Languages Research Project* (12pp.)

Spring 1993

36. Frank Maguire, *Sign languages: an introduction to their social context and their structure* (39pp.)

37. Ema Ushioda, *Acculturation theory and linguistic fossilization: a comparative case study* (54pp.)

Summer 1994

38. Carl James, Phil Scholfield and George Ypsiladis, *Cross-cultural correspondence: letters of application* (28pp.)

39. Dieter Wolff, *New approaches to language teaching: an overview* (18pp.)

Spring 1995

40. James A. Coleman, *Progress, proficiency and motivation among British university language learners* (38pp.)